

# THE LECOMPTON CONSTITUTION.

## SPEECH

OF

HON. S. G. ANDREWS, OF NEW YORK.

Delivered in the House of Representatives, February 23d, 1858.

Mr. Chairman, while difference and conflict of opinion prevail on most if not on all other questions submitted to the consideration of Congress and the country, there is one sentiment in the President's message which will be very generally concurred in, but in a sense entirely different from that entertained by the President. He says, in regard to the agitation growing out of Kansas affairs: "They have for some years occupied too much of the public attention; it is high time that attention should be directed to other subjects." And in the recent message accompanying the Lecompton Constitution, the President repeats that this agitation has continued "too long." In my judgment, these statements will not be disputed.

From the beginning of the agitation, four years ago, the whole country has been convulsed from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico, in every hamlet and every family. Kansas has furnished the fireside talk and the engrossing topic of discussion in public assemblies and political debates. No question since the war of 1812 has occupied the public attention so generally, or moved the public mind so profoundly.

Within that Territory, a struggle has been intense on the part of the settlers, to secure a free vote on the question of forming their own organic law, the law under which they and their descendants are to live, and in which they and theirs are vitally interested. For this they had the solemn pledge of the Government, embodied in the very act of Congress which

brought their Territory into being. The Kansas-Nebraska act guarantied to them the right to form and establish their institutions by such a vote; and yet their very first election was carried against them by the incursion of lawless inhabitants of a neighboring State, who designed to and did form their institutions for them, usurped their Government, and elected a Legislature, whose laws and enactments were pronounced, by partisans of those aggressors upon this floor, to be "a disgrace to civilization." Citizens of Missouri did overawe, imprison, and murder those settlers, and enact outrages upon their persons and property, unparalleled in the history of the country.

Those settlers were mainly the free-born sons of New England—the men who build churches and school-houses, who scatter the blessings and benefits of civilization wherever they go. They went out from their father's house to their own inheritance, to "make the solitary place rejoice," to nurture the graces of moral life and beauty in the wilderness. They were murdered on their prairie hearthstones, and their wives and children were compelled to fly to a deeper solitude for security against greater outrages. The arm of the Government, their natural protector, was withheld from their defence and protection. On the contrary, an armed force was kept in requisition to overawe and restrain them from resistance of their invaders. The Government, bound to shield them, in point of fact aided in drowning the popular voice, by fraudulent votes and returns of elections,

with the concurrence of its own sworn officers. I beg leave to refer to an extract from a report of the Hon. J. COLLAMER, of the Senate, submitted at the last session of Congress, which presents, very graphically, the then existing state of affairs in Kansas:

"I state, from information which I regard as entirely reliable, and as facts which I believe capable of the most unquestionable proof, which can at any time be presented, that of the six thousand three hundred and thirty-one votes cast in March, 1855, for the election of the Legislative Assembly of Kansas, four thousand nine hundred and twenty-one of them were cast by armed bands of the inhabitants of Missouri, who invaded Kansas for that purpose, on that occasion; that only one thousand four hundred and ten legal votes were cast, and a majority of those were for the Free State candidates, though most of the Free State voters were driven from the polls. This invasion extended to all the Representative districts but one, and elected and controlled a large majority of both Houses. The people of the Territory have not been left free, but have been invaded and subjugated, and they are, and their institutions have been, controlled by the people of Missouri, through and by the tyrannical laws enacted by that Assembly, and more tyrannically enforced by the officers by them appointed. These laws, so made by usurpation, the Executive of this Government has aided to enforce, and in Congress no relief has been granted. The complaints and representations of this usurpation and perversion of the organic act have been represented here as complaints of a mere irregularity, and been treated by the Senate with apparent indifference and neglect, as no measure even of inquiry into their truth has been instituted.

"Abandoned to their oppressors, the Free State people of Kansas have been pursued by them in the same spirit which made the invasion. The acts of said Assembly have by their officers been made the cover for all forms of political persecution and oppression. Indictments for constructive treason and pretended nuisances deprive them of liberty and destroy their property. Under the form of sheriff's *posses*, armed bands of people from without the Territory prowl over it, and take and destroy property and lives, and intimidate and drive off the Free State people. These people have thus, for several months past, been harassed and scattered, and any attempt at self-defence has been repressed by the army of the United States, or been declared *constructive treason*, and treated accordingly. The settlers have thus in large numbers been driven from their settlements and from the Territory. This is but a brief and feeble statement of the facts. A full picture of the public atrocities and private violence which have been committed with impunity upon the Free State people of Kansas, would excite and arouse the deepest sentiment of indignation."

Well, sir, the agitation still continues;

there is no abatement of it, here or elsewhere, in Kansas or out of Kansas. Recently, on the floor of this House, its continued intensity has been exhibited, by acts of personal collision and violence. Who, then, will gainsay or deny the President's assertion, that this agitation has continued "*too long*?"

There is one other proposition deducible from the whole facts in the case, which is not referred to in the message, but upon which, nevertheless, the like unanimity of sentiment must prevail, namely: that there has been no moment of time, during this four years of violence in Kansas, and disorder out of it, when the President could not have terminated the difficulty and ended the agitation by a *dash of his pen*. The former President could have done so, as could his successor, now as then; and at any time can he give the country quiet in this matter, in the very easy manner in which the plighted faith of the Government was pledged to do from the first. There can therefore be no more difference of opinion in regard to the responsibility than of the "*too long*" continuance of this difficulty. The Government is responsible for the beginning and continuance of the agitation, and for all its consequences; and this must be manifest to the country and mankind. Had protection been given to the people in their efforts for free government; had their right of suffrage been secured to them; had the arms of the United States been employed for them—as alone the Government has authority to employ them, "to suppress insurrection and repel invasion"—instead of against them, and in defiance of the Constitution, then there would have been no agitation in Kansas, but she would have been long ago a free State of this Confederacy, in the quiet exercise of her own lawful authority.

There has been no mystery in either the origin or continuance of this agitation; the same thing would happen whenever popular rights were invaded or abridged, under any Government but an extreme despotism; wherever the people were fit to govern themselves, or possessed "rights to be respected," they would be impelled to such a struggle by the patriotic consideration suggested by Mr. Jefferson in his first inaugural: "Jealousy of the right of election is the vital principle of Repub-

lics." Why, sir, no such instance of paternal desertion and barbarity in any Government stands upon record, and a parallel with the struggling heroism and forbearance of the people of Kansas remains to be recorded.

The persistence in the determination to force slavery upon this Territory, in the face of popular opposition and the remonstrance of the chosen officers of the Government, is most remarkable. It is seeking slavery under all the stern difficulties which men are usually willing to encounter only to secure freedom.

First, Mr. Reeder, an unwavering Democrat, was selected for Governor; he was compelled to protest against the invasion of Missourians to control the elections and subjugate the Territory, and he was displaced. Governor Shannon was alike unsuccessful in his mission, and went into retirement. Governor Geary returned also, with bitter protests against the course of procedure and the insane policy of the Government. The protests of these successive functionaries were disregarded, and their advice, as to the course which justice and fair dealing directed, was rejected by the former Administration. The present one gained no lessons of wisdom, justice, or humanity, from the failure of the former; followed the same line of policy, with more settled purpose, and resolved to make an end of the controversy at once. For this object, a man of tried political character and great experience in public affairs was selected, a chosen champion of Southern interests, and one of the leading statesmen of the Union—Robert J. Walker; having associated with him, as Secretary, Mr. Stanton, scarcely less favorably known to the Democracy, for his devotion. These gentlemen began the work in earnest; they proceeded immediately to Kansas; and found the same denial of right, the same prostitution of the ballot, bold and shameless; "a light shone round about them," and their conversion was complete; they also expostulated with the Government, and finally protested against the action of the Lecompton Convention, and for this met the fate of their predecessors.

The testimony of these chosen witnesses had no effect to change or modify the settled purpose of the Administration, but was wholly rejected; and a Constitu-

tion thus denounced, neither authorized by Congress nor elected by the people, nor having the essential basis of a legal census, and against the popular voice by over ten thousand majority in a voting population of about twelve thousand, comes here, backed with the same Executive determination, for our ratification. Upon what ground of justice or propriety should it be ratified?

The honorable gentlemen from Alabama [Mr. SHORTER] and from Virginia [Mr. CLEMENS] hold that the Kansas-Nebraska law was an enabling act; and that when the people voted under it, and adopted a Constitution, they became, *ipso facto*, a State, in or out of the Union. Now, no Territory can become a State, unless Congress admit it as such; its elections are merely provisional; it has Congressmen or not, and Senators or not, according as Congress shall determine; it remains a Territory until Congress admit it as a State. Besides, sir, if Congress enabled anybody by that law, it was the people of Kansas; and they refused to act under it, and did not act. It is not at all material whether the law was an enabling act or not; the people have the same right, with or without one, to organize a State provisionally, and to apply to Congress for admission. This was the fact in the cases cited by the gentlemen; but California and the others were no States until Congress admitted them as such; nor can any State be, except by a successful rebellion.

The question here is, whether the people of Kansas did adopt this Constitution, and desire to be admitted under it? They did no such thing. Their first proceeding under it was the election held to decide whether there should be a Lecompton Convention or not, and the election itself was ordered by a Territorial Legislature, in which the people never did acquiesce. The law was a fraud, and the people refused to attend the election of delegates to that Convention, which was also fraudulent, because half the people were not registered, as required by law; they therefore refused to vote or take any part in the election. When the Territorial election came on, a Legislature and members of Congress were elected upon a distinct issue of repudiation of the Convention which had formed the Constitu-

tion, and refused to submit it to the people, for the openly-avowed reason that it would be voted down. When, on the 21st of December, the election was held under it, they refused to participate in it, because the question of its acceptance or rejection was not to be submitted; and at the same time State officers were elected under protest, in the name of the people of Kansas, which protest is now here before Congress. Do the gentlemen hold that Kansas can be forced into the Union "against the consent of the governed," because Congress had enabled them, when, even according to the showing of the President himself, the people of Kansas are, at this moment, in a state of armed rebellion against this very Constitution? For these reasons, whether this law was an enabling act or not, is of no sort of importance.

But for the obstinate determination to force the Territory into the Union as slave State, in the face of facts and evidence, she would have presented a Constitution here long ago, of her own choice and adoption. I am bound to avow, however, sir, that I could not have voted for any Constitution sanctioning property in man, by any of its provisions, framed at Leecompton or elsewhere, for that or any Territory. Such is my abhorrence of slavery and oppression, whether in Hungary, or Poland, or Ireland, or South Carolina, and in all lands or continents, and on all the islands in the limitless seas, that under no conceivable circumstances would I vote for the addition of one foot of slave territory to this Confederacy, though the application came here with the sanction of every vote in the proposed State; for, under the Constitution which I am sworn to support, as "I understand it," such could not be a "Republican Constitution." I should, on that question, exercise my reserved right to vote, as one of the people, if need be, against any number, or all others; holding, as I do, that "republican" means the equality of all men.

Mr. Chairman, although the President could have terminated the Kansas agitation by the easy means already indicated, for which omission and dereliction he, like his predecessor, may be so unfortunate as to live long enough to follow as chief mourner at the funeral of his own repu-

tation, nevertheless he could not have quieted what is called the slavery agitation—that he is not responsible for; it is beyond the jurisdiction of his high office; that will not down at his bidding, though you were to admit into the Union any number of slave States. When that shall appear ordered and settled upon compromises firm as was the Missouri, when everything on the surface of affairs is tranquil and serene, "calm as a summer sea," it will be found a deceitful calm, an unnatural tranquillity; for the depths are vexed, and every slight disturbing cause will create agitation afresh. In the midst of profound quiet, a cry will come from the very clouds, "there's a negro in the fence!" to startle and alarm; and the agitation will be at once renewed, freshened, and invigorated from its very rest, and this will be but the repetition of the thing, until the last negro is out of the fence. The counter forces of freedom and slavery are at work, and they will ever be, until one or the other shall triumph. If the records of faithful history are reliable, if the parallels of the past are to be regarded, it is not difficult to augur the result of that controversy; it may be determined by peaceful means, or by forcible means. Heaven grant that it may prove a peaceful triumph, for it pains me to imagine such an event as masters availing themselves of the underground railroad to escape from the indignant and retributive pursuit of their own slaves; or that more fearful alternative of Providence, some Moses raised up to lead the bondmen through the Red sea. Ay, sir, the *Red sea*! No; I will not suffer myself to contemplate a triumph such as that, even for freedom.

The honorable gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GARTRELL] speaks painedly. I thank him for his free speech. That is what we hold to. He would be no doughface, were he of the North; his rebuke of that unfortunate class of persons must be keenly felt. The gentleman differs widely, however, from Mr. Jefferson, Mr. Madison, and all the great founders of the Republic. They regarded slavery as more than a misfortune, "an evil, and a crime."

"The principle is this, and will ever remain in force, that men, by nature, are free."—*Continental Congress*, 1779.

"It is conceded, on all hands, that the right to

be free can never be alienated."—*Continental Congress.*

"It is among my first wishes to see some plan by which slavery in this country can be abolished by law."—*Washington.*

"Slavery is contrary to the law of nature and of nations."—*William Wirt.*

"Slavery is repugnant to the principles of Christianity; it prostrates every benevolent action of the human heart."—*Patrick Henry.*

"The way, I hope, is preparing, under the auspices of Heaven, for a total emancipation."—*Jefferson.*

The honorable gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GARTRELL] has opened this slavery question for discussion. I desire to look for a moment at his line of argument. He says :

"As a Southern man, proud of the place of my nativity; as the owner of slaves; as conscientious of my moral obligations, I trust, as any gentleman on this floor, I hesitate not, here or elsewhere, to defend this institution as being strictly in accordance with the principles of right, of Christian duties, and of morality, and as having the highest sanction of laws, both human and divine. I rejoice that the public mind at the South is being awakened to this view of the question. The time for apologies to the South is past. I am here to-day (and the Southern people who have this institution in their midst are to-day prepared to do the same) to stand up before the nations of the world, and defiantly defend and justify domestic slavery in its greatest length, extent, and breadth.

\* \* \* I proclaim now, that this institution is not only sanctioned by the Constitution of your country, under which we all appear here to-day, but is sanctioned by records of the highest character. That that institution has existed from the earliest periods of history, no man of ordinary intelligence will deny. We learn from the Holy Scriptures, that Abraham, and many other wise and good men of that day, not only held slaves, but exercised acts of complete ownership over them; and that God himself, after he had rescued the children of Israel from the house of bondage, sanctioned and recognised slavery, both in principle and in practice. In defining the rules for their government and their moral observance, it was prescribed that—

"Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's man-servant, nor his maid-servant, nor anything that is thy neighbor's."

"Thus, sir, not only sanctioning Slavery, but providing for its protection for all time to come. I beg leave most respectfully to commend this commandment to the attention of the gentlemen who sit on the other side of this Hall; and, sir, I trust they will cease to covet our men-servants, and our maid-servants, too; and if they do covet them, that they at least will not attempt to deprive us of them by means in violation of the Constitution of our common country.

"Besides, this institution is not only recognised by divine authority, but it is perpetuated. I ask the attention of the House to that portion of Holy Writ. \* \* \* African slaves having been taken

from among the heathen, by our ancestor England and by our forefathers in the North, as their descendants, claim them as an inheritance to us and to our children, 'to inherit them as a possession,' and they shall be our bondmen and bondwomen forever."

In an unenlightened age, slaves have been honestly acquired, and an honest inheritance, according to the received opinion of the time. Conquest gave them and men were the spoils of the vanquished; capture of enemies in war was, however, the only ground of title then.

In that darker age, slavery was held to be a violation of natural law; then, kidnapping and man-stealing could not give one man a title to the person or service of another man. The same disability must exist in this more enlightened age. A stream cannot rise no higher than its source. What is bad in its inception, cannot be cured though it obtain the endorsement of a multitude of responsible names. No successions of bargains and sales can give validity to a corrupt title. Running out to a legal principle to its proper conclusion as an application, the propriety of the old maxim, touching "the partaker," will be apparent. Men held by right of conquest, and always might, reconquer themselves, their persons, and their rights whosoever they can; it is always regarded the noblest ambition of men, and subjugated nations, to rise with whatever power they may, and wrest themselves from their oppressors. The whole world sympathizes in every such struggle; a every heart of the most remote inhabitant of civilization is animated by a feeling of common interest with all who strike for freedom. The people of our country have often exhibited their sympathy with oppressed nations in such struggles, and have, on several occasions, rendered material aid to the efforts of nations striving to redress and free themselves.

But, sir, I hold that men are not property, even by right of conquest, which the only right ever contended for anywhere. I hold that no being, possessing physical and moral faculties common to human beings, can, by any Constitution or laws, be goods and chattels; the Constitution of the United States admits this fact, by treating persons held in slavery as "persons, not property"—"persons held to labor," is the language; and this holding is incompatible with the idea

property. The Declaration, to which the Constitution is referable for explanation, declares that *all* men are created equal, and are entitled to certain rights; the Constitution was never held to impair, by any construction, that Declaration; the Constitution of the United States knows nobody under any other name or style than persons. Where is the right given in that instrument to a party, as owner of a man as property? I know of none, and I should like any strict constructionist, here or elsewhere, to instruct me.

The framers of the Constitution have used language having an opposite meaning, quite another and different significance, than owner, property, and the like—persons;” they say persons legally held to labor; and certainly persons, held by moral or legal obligations to the performance of duties, are very different in their nature from mere chattels or property. Every member of Congress, the honorable gentleman from Georgia included, is described in that instrument by the same term, and by no other term.

These arguments for slavery are gathered from that remote age when bondmen were the captives of “a man’s sword and his bow”—a sanguinary period. Even when kidnapping and man-stealing met the oath penalty by Divine command. The gentleman quoted the tenth commandment for *our* reflection; but the eighth comes before it, and carries equal sanctions. Let that be reverently considered so. I do not know, sir, that anybody at the North “covets or desires” to meddle with these “men-servants or maid-servants.” Our Southern friends have them all and entirely to themselves. Nor do I now that we have ever claimed the right to interfere with *that* domestic institution in the States—certainly not, unless the Missouri compromise repeal might authorize the war to be carried into *Africa*. The gentleman claims for slavery a greater exemption from crime than prevails in a free community, and produces the police records of New York in proof. I am forced to admit that we have no exemption from crime in New York to boast of; yet let me say, we have few crimes of greater enormity than selling wives and children at the auction block.

In regard to this argument drawn from

antiquity, I reply, that its fields have all been reaped, gleaned, and garnered. The accumulated wisdom of past ages is, of the present time, to be shone upon and sanctified by Christianity, which teaches the fulfilment “of all the law and the prophets,” in the higher injunction of universal brotherhood. The world moves, and “the ignorance that was winked” at, “becomes monstrous in the light of that great Christian obligation.

The ingenious Doctor Franklin has anticipated all these arguments for slavery of the African, “a heathen race,” as the gentleman terms them, in his account of a report of the Divan of Algiers, one hundred and seventy years ago, upon a petition to abolish the slavery of white Christian men in that State.

A petition was presented to the Divan of Algiers, praying for the abolition of piracy and slavery, as being unjust; and the report of a member of the Divan is as follows:

“Have these persons considered the consequences of granting their petition? If we cease our cruises against the Christians, how shall we be furnished with commodities so necessary for us? If we forbear to make slaves of their people, who in this hot climate are to cultivate our lands? Who are to perform the common labors in our families? Must we not, then, be our own slaves? Is there not more favor due to us than to these Christian dogs? We have about fifty thousand slaves; this number, if not kept up by fresh supplies, will gradually be annihilated; our lands will become of no value, for want of cultivation; the rents of houses will sink one-half: for what? To gratify the whims of a whimsical sect, who would have us forbear making more slaves not only, but even manumit those we have.

“But who is to indemnify their masters for this loss; and would they, to do what they think justice to the slaves, do greater injustice to their owners? And if we set our slaves at liberty, what is to be done with them? Few would return to their own country. Must we maintain them; for men accustomed to slavery will not work when not compelled; and what is there so pitiable in their present condition? Is their condition made worse by falling into our hands? No; for they have only exchanged one slavery for a better; they have the opportunity of saving their immortal souls. They are too ignorant to establish a good government. While serving us, we take good care of them; provide them everything, and treat them with humanity. The laborers in their own country are worse fed, worse lodged and clothed; the condition of many of them is therefore already mended, and requires no further improvement. Here their lives are in safety. If some of these mad bigots, who tease

us with their petitions, have freed their slaves in their blind zeal, it was not humanity.

"How grossly are they mistaken who imagine that the Alcoran disallows slavery! Are not the two precepts—to quote no more—'Masters, treat your slaves with kindness,' 'Slaves, serve your masters with cheerfulness and fidelity'—clear proofs to the contrary? Let us hear no more of this detestable proposition, the adoption of which would be depreciating our lands and depriving so many good citizens of their properties."

The Divan passed this resolution:

"The doctrine that plundering and enslaving Christians is unjust, is at least *problematical*; but that it is the interest of the State to continue the practice is clear; therefore, let the petition be rejected."

Men's interests are operated on with surprising similarity in all countries and climates. These were white men, slaves in *Africa*.

The gentleman from Georgia and others threaten a dissolution of the Union if this so-called Leecompton Constitution be not treated with favor here; that, let me say, is beating upon the same old parchment around this Hall, giving forth the same monotonous sounds, provoking only weariness. For my own part, sir, I am disgusted with that maimed, bloated, bandaged old form, that has hobbled on crutches and staves by day, and been set up with, watched, and nursed, on its miserable couch by night, so long. I desire to see the hale and stalwart personification of Union which the fathers sketched and left us, sound, reliable, cordial, and of hearty cheer; I desire to see no other representation or reality. If the gentleman's State is impatient of parental and wholesome restraint, rather than these threats, complaints, and heart-burnings, I would vote to-day to divide to her her share of the common inheritance, with an additional and liberal outfit to enable her to set up housekeeping on her own account, and let her go, and no more words about it; when she comes back, suppliant for readmission, knocking at our door, as she must do in about ninety days, we will then consider the question of annexation; yes, sir, we will think of that.

I desire to tell the gentleman a story illustrative of the position of his State, and the consequence to follow the execution of these threats of dissolution. A son of the Emerald Isle, employed in digging a well, was let down about half way, some twenty feet, when the rope by

which he was suspended became entangled in the machinery. He became impatient of his position, and, thoughtful of consequences, he cried out, "If you don't let me up, or let me down, I'll cut the rope." So would these gentlemen cut the rope. The Administration rease justly, no doubt, that as a question of party policy, its reliance must be upon the Southern Democracy; it has abundant reason, from the past, for confidence in Northern compliance. The annexation of Texas and the repeal of the Missouri compromise had both the one object, the extension of slavery. The success of those measures involved the political ruin of Northern adherents who voted for them and threw the Democratic party at the North into a minority, but the North returned to its allegiance in due time. The result authorizes further exactions by the South, and confidence in further and future compliance on the part of the North. They have every reason to assume that they can treat their Northern allies—

"As a huntsman his pack,  
For when he pleases, he can whistle them back

There may come a time when the Northern wing of the party will perceive that the Government has become a great Southern agency, with the President of the United States its chief clerk, and may be disposed to yield to interest or to patriotism what is now given to party. Has the time now come? There are indications in an important direction of that hopeful result, as appears from the following extract from the New York *Freeman's Journal*, a Roman Catholic and Democratic paper. It says:

"What is the practical difference between the 'royal prerogative' claimed by the weak and tyrannical Stuarts, and the Executive influence so impudently flaunted in our faces by the advocates of the fraudulent Constitution of the Leecomptonites? The only difference is, that the 'Executive influence' is viler in its nature, more demoralizing, and more potent, than the 'royal prerogative' which lives in the execration of free men. We have been told, day by day, by the servants and the seekers of the Government, that some ten millions of dollars of 'patronage' are to be employed in buying the votes of the absence of a sufficient number of the representatives of the people, to secure the passage of an act deadly to the interests of the country and to the fundamental principles of our institutions."

The President deprecates the effect of the defeat of this measure upon the four slave States, and says, a "keen sensibility will be felt by them at so untoward event." His sympathy appears in no degree awakened to any violence to the sensibility of fifteen Northern States. With equal show of propriety might the President fear for their sensibility at the "untoward event" of any Northern State having been permitted to flourish under the Constitutions; and so far as that regard goes, they might be exhorted to yield, to blunt the "keen" edge of Southern sensibility. They will not yield themselves or Kansas to that appeal—it is quite too sectional.

The gentleman from New York, my honorable colleague, [Mr. HASKIN,] very frankly foreshadows the policy of the Government, with a view to the settlement of all these exciting questions. When he went for "wholesale appropriation" of foreign territory by the Government—acquisition by conquest instead of predatory incursions and petty occupation by individuals in arms; robbers on their own account—the gentleman indicated the humane view of that subject, one that will direct the public mind to serious reflection thereon; and at the same time he promulgated to this House the policy of the Government quite distinctly, as by authority. The basis of that policy is to be the Osage circular.

Walker, hitherto supposed to be a

secret agent of the Government, is to be abandoned to his fate, as was his ancient prototype, Robert Kidd, in whose enterprises the British King is said also to have shared. The transit route is to be guaranteed to the satisfaction of England and France; war is to be made, or threatened, upon Spain, on some pretence; Cuba is to be our indemnity for claims against her, and the consideration to the South for the loss of "FREE KANSAS" as well. That is the programme. Cuba, sir, is nearer the coast of Guinea than our Southern main is; and even though the slave trade may remain prohibited—as it will ever remain—it will be quite as easy for slavers to slip through the Gulf squadron as it was for Walker and his "cankers of a calm world and a long peace," especially if its future commander be less a matter-of-fact man than Commodore Paulding was—one who understands that *words* of instructions are intended to cover and conceal orders.

But, sir, such a scheme, plausible as it may appear, will not settle these questions; the idea is delusive; it will protract the agitation. The field of agitation will be widened and extended; it will have more verge and scope; there will be more land for Freedom to possess, and the tropics may become the theatre of its highest achievements in the ascendancy of liberty and law.

For Freedom throughout this Union, and over all this vast continent, is **MANIFEST DESTINY**.

---

WASHINGTON, D. C.

BUELL & BLANCHARD, PRINTERS.

1858.